DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 435 UD 012 425

AUTHOR Peachey, Paul, Ed.; Mudd, Rita, Ed.
TITLE Evolving Patterns of Ethnicity in American Life.
INSTITUTION National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 1 Jun 71
NOTE 62p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Pluralism; *Ethnic Distribution; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Relations; Ethnic Stereotypes; *Ethnic Studies; Identification (Psychological); Intergroup Relations; Self Concept; Social Integration; Social Values; Urban Environment; *Urban Population; Urban Studies; Voting

ABSTRACT

The papers in this volume are based on presentations made to the Workshop on Urban Ethnic Community Development held in June, 1970, at the Catholic University of America and sponsored by the Urban Task Force of the United States Catholic Conference. Robert Janes summarizes and updates the account of the nature and the role of ethnic groups in American history. Richard Scammon, using one of the important indicators of ethnicity, namely voting patterns, points to both persistence and change in ethnicity in American life. Turning to the social psychological side, Otto von Mering underscores the positive function of ethnicity in identity formation, as well as the distortions and stereotypes which readily emerge in inter-group relations. Finally, Richard Kolm advances some propositions concerning the meaning of ethnicity, which pose two general types of questions: (1) what is the general nature of ethnicity in the United States, particularly with regard to values? (2) Is cultural diversity or cultural pluralism in American society feasible and viable? (Author/JM)

ED 063435

EVOLVING PATTERNS OF ETHNICITY IN AMERICAN LIFE

Edited by

Paul Peachey
Sister Rita Mudd

with

Foreword by

Msgr. Geno Baroni

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JUN 1 1971

UD 012425

Published by

The National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs
at The Catholic University of America
702 Lawrence Street, northeast
Washington, D. C. 20017

CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword	Msgr. Geno Baroni	1
Introduction	Paul Peachey Sister Rita Mudd	3
The Shape and Role of Ethnic Groups In American History: An Overview	Robert W. Janes	7
The Ethnic Circumstances: America At the Polls	Richard M. Scammon	23
Rethinking Ethnic Identity: The Group and The Person	Otto von Mering	30
Ethnicity in American Society: Some Problems of a Theoretical Framework	Richard Kolm	48

FOREWORD

As our nation continues to struggle with its identity and purpose in the 1970's, a new appreciation of our diverse ethnic history and cultural heritage will play an increasingly important role. The unfulfilled hope of the early 1960's ended in the alienation of many young affluent students, the angry bitterness of the poor black and brown urban community, the economic, social, cultural, and political anxiety of the heavily ethnic working class.

Today's challenge requires a new vision and perspective that will redefine America with a new sense of identity, a new sense of purpose, a new sense of unity. The painful process of developing a new awareness and self-image becomes personal as one struggles with the questions: "Who am I?" - "Who are we?" The late 60's spoke to us in terms of a "divided society" and "inevitable group conflict" as the American dream threatened to become an American nightmare for everyone.

Shortly after the United States Catholic Bishop's statement on the Urban Crisis was issued in 1968, and the Urban Task Force was created at the United States Catholic Conference to "suggest specific steps which can be taken, and to point the direction in which future actions should be guided." The Task Force assisted in the formation of the "self-help" rationale of the Church's national response to poverty in the Campaign for Human Development. The Task Force also became sensitive to the strong evidence of growing ethnic pride in the black and brown community and began to study the persistent ethnic factor in northern urban, heavily Catholic communities.

An early analysis of the urban population in northern and industrial areas highlighted the fact that the white population remaining in many of our older cities was heavily working class and predominantly first, second, and third generation ethnic Americans.

The papers in this volume are based on presentations made to the Workshop on Urban Ethnic Community Development held in June, 1970, at the Catholic University of America, sponsored by the Urban Task Force of the United States Catholic Conference. The workshop was the first major effort by the Church to bring national attention to the needs and problems of ethnic Americans in urban areas. As national attention focuses anew on the older working class or ethnic areas in American cities, new challenges confront the academic community as well. How will the scholars and the scientists respond? Can they provide the resources which the men of action seek? Hopefully these papers will help to stimulate the conversation between the men of action and the men of reflection.

Msgr. Geno Baroni
Director

The National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs

INTRODUCTION

Paradox, indeed contradiction, appears on the surface as the most striking characteristic of the decade of the 1960's in American society. An overly hopeful phase of development, during which it was believed that "black and white together" would "overcome," was followed quickly by a second phase marked by sullen clashes among population groups newly conscious of their particularities. Movements dedicated to the fulfillment of the American dream, in which all men confront the society as equals, produced instead new awareness and espousal of differences.

The change first occurred among Blacks. Quickly other smaller groups likewise were set in motion. Before long, however, the quest came to be felt within the White "majority" as well. In part, this came as reaction or reply to the dynamism expressed among the minorities. But other and more basic strains came to be felt as well - a futile and unending war, a technology, an economy, and even a polity, out of hand, disarrayed. By the end of this disappointing decade, insecurity seemed to seep through foundations and walls everywhere in American life. As the presumably higher synthesis in personality and culture began to break down, individuals and groups were thrown back to earlier layers of development. Counter culture "cop-out" phenomena, ranging from the "freaking" of the young to the Esalen cult of the affluent, are among the symptoms of such regression.

In this context, an earlier fissure in the White majority becomes newly visible. Some demographers have distinguished between the "old" and the "new" immigrations comprising the European stock in the American population. The former category includes the colonial and post-colonial periods, during which time the immigrants were mostly white, Anglo-Saxon, and Protestant (WASP).

The latter refers to the approximately 20 million Europeans who came to these shores between 1880 and 1925, who though white, were non-Protestant and to a considerable extent Latin or Slavic rather than Protestant and Anglo-Saxon. Equally important was another basic difference between the two white populations. The "old" immigration had settled on the receding frontier and had built an agrarian republic. Out of this conquest came the capital which was to underwrite the industrialization of the nation. The "new" immigrants, however, though predominantly of peasant background, were destined for factories in burgeoning industrial centers rather than for rural homesteads. Two processes - Americanization and urbanization - thus merged, with consequences of bewildering complexity.

The reception and adaptation of the "new" immigrants was a sometimes turbulent process. Many were successful economically and otherwise, and in recent decades the animosities first engendered tended to dissipate. The civil rights movement of the early 1960's was based on an alliance of Blacks and liberal WASP's, and alliance which many other whites resented, and which was perceived eventually by some descendants of the "new" immigration as a direct threat. What the later years of the 1960's suggest to some observers is that the natural allies of Blacks are not the liberal Whites whose position appears sufficiently secure to tolerate the advance of minorities with no threat to themselves, but all disadvantaged minorities, white and black, who as it turns out in many areas comprise the numerical majority. At this level the paradox repeats itself: to achieve equality, capitalize on inequality.

While ultimately only history can arbitrate the outcome, much hinges on our ability to locate these developments in a broader and more basic framework of both analysis and policy. For at the heart of the agony of the 1960's one perceives clearly the agony that has been the lot of all historical societies.

Only at the expense of the tribal, the local, or communal groupings can wider societies grow. Yet the wider societies remain directly dependent on the very communal matrix which they most transcend if they are to come into existence in the first place. This anomaly has developed its full force only since the industrial revolution. Yet, already ancient writers, using such terms as yin or yang,or Dionysian and Appollonian, pointed to contrasting forces within social groups.

Closer to our immediate problem is the pair of terms introduced late in the nineteenth century by Ferdinand Tönnies, namely Gemeinschaft (community) and Gesellschaft (society). The former refers to the solidarity characteristic of families, tribes, neighborhoods or villages which unite many separate roles or identities into functioning wholes, while the latter refers to the many specialized systems of human action (complex industrial or economic organizations) which make possible our huge modern societies but which are indifferent or inimical to intimacy or wholeness. Both Americanization and urbanization represent the force of society, while the continued cohesion of ethnic groups represent dimensions of community. The "one man, one vote" principle underlying both our polity and our economy is often more honored in the breach than in practice. Every time political or economic access is denied for reasons of race, ethnicity or religion, the society is imperilled.

The pendulum swings. If in one era, "melting pot" expectations are exaggerated, in another, the values of pluralism are emphasized. Today the conflict between the forces appears to intensify. Only increased centralization and coordination will solve problems of disequilibrium in city and suburb. Separate and independent solutions are not possible. Yet the humanizing of the urban system, and creation of communities on a human scale are equally urgent. How can these requirements be reconciled?

In the present volume of papers, Robert Janes summarizes and updates the account of the nature and the role of ethnic groups in American history. Richard Scammon, using one of the important indicators of ethnicity, namely voting patterns, points to both persistence and change in ethnicity in American life. Turning to the social psychological side, Otto von Mering underscores the positive function of ethncity in identity formation, as well as the distortions and stereotypes which readily emerge in inter-group relations. Finally, Richard Kolm advances some propositions concerning the meaning of ethnicity, which should stimulate the effective use of the remaining materials in the volume. The editors are deeply grateful to these scholars for their contribution, and to the staff of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs for their assistance in the preparation of the text.

Paul Peachey

Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
The Catholic University of America

Sister Rita Mudd
Assistant Director

The National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs

THE SHAPE AND ROLE OF ETHNIC GROUPS IN AMERICAN HISTORY: AN OVERVIEW

Robert W. Janes*

* Professor of Sociology, University of Maryland

I am going to approach this topic in a somewhat focused version entitled Urbanism and Ethnic Groups in America. I believe this focusing is useful to our purpose in the conference because it brings together two of the major present trends in the nation, what is happening to our cities and what is happening among those social groupings built around the collective experience of immigrants to the United States. These happenings are significant developments in our national history. They touch all of us; and how we as a generation meet them will go a long way to determine what kind of a society we leave for the coming generations.

These two present conditions, the changing city and the pressures on the ethnic communities are complex issues. They both have a long history; they, each in their own way, reflect the larger society and its socio-economic development. Our cities grew in the last century because we became an industrialized nation. Our cities are now growing because our economic base is centering on the satisfaction of service needs and mass consumption rather than industrial production and manufacturing. Immigrants came to our shores in increasing numbers as our industrial activity expanded. Cities and immigrants have gone hand in hand -- the growth of the American city was largely a consequence of foreign-born immigration -- especially for those urban communities located in the northeast and midwest. This fact is explained by the situation that the typical W.A S.P. (white Anglo-Saxon Protestant) as an original ethnic, was, until a few years ago, either a farmer or small-town resident.

The experience of the foreign-born with the city created the present American ethnic groups. There have been two kinds of ethnic groups in the United States, one merged easily with the original W.A.S.P. stock.

These groups included Germans, Canadian Protestants, Scandinavians, and the various brands of the English. The second groups were peoples such as the Italians, Poles, Mexicans, Jews, Hungarians, Czechs and now the Blacks. They were socially more removed from the W.A.S.P. people than the first group of immigrants. They came to the United States to supply the demand for industrial labor and in time developed a strong sense of group identity as a consequence of their historical background and their social experience in the United States.

It is the second group which I wish to consider in their involvement with the changing urban scene. An interesting thing is apparently happening to these groups in the course of their continuing urban experience. They are not being assimilated into socially homogenized membership in the W.A.S.P. majority in the manner called for by the long-standing melting-pot ideology. Rather, they seem to be creating a basis for a pluralist type of urban community in which a variety of ethnic identities are maintained, rather than a standardized ladder of class levels up which socially mobile are supposed to climb. I will try to give an overview as to how this unexpected development has emerged as the present culmination of the history of ethnic groups in the United States; and I will attempt some modest predictions of what will be the situation of ethnic groups by the end of the century if the present urban trends in the United States continue in the direction in which they have begun to move.

My overview and predictions will touch briefly on the following points:

1. Phases of urban development in the United States
2. The main immigrant groupings which produced our present ethnic communities
3. The ingredients of viable ethnicity
4. Emerging metropolises as opportunity and challenges to ethnicity
5. Predictions and conclusions about the pluralist metropolitan community

Phases of Urban Development in the United States

Since the founding of the Republic the nation has gone through at least four phases of urban growth. In each phase the city played a different role in the nation, and these varying roles involved different patterns of foreign-born immigration and different functions by immigrants within the cities and total society. The first phase was from 1790 to 1880 and it may be called the phase of Agrarian Society. During this period the population was primarily rural and small-town although a number of cities built mainly around trade, commerce, transportation and administration had emerged. Immigrants were mainly the Irish, Germans, English, and Scandinavians, many of whom settled in the midwest and often in the rural areas. Although the rate of increase of the number of city-dwellers was always greater than that of the rural people during this period, the absolute increase in population was always greater in the rural group. That is why this period is called an Agrarian Phase although a number of cities such as New York, Chicago, St. Louis, and Cincinnati were showing rapid growth.

Phase of the Rise of the Cities

In the 1880's the absolute growth of the urban population became greater than that of the rural places. New immigrant groups began to arrive and their destinations were mainly the industrializing cities such as Pittsburgh, Chicago, Erie, Cleveland, etc. This period, the Rise of the Cities, extended from 1880 to 1920 and the growth of city population was a consequence largely of foreign immigration. Ethnic groups represented included Italians, Poles, Jews, Czechs, Hungarians, and Slovaks. The older ethnic streams still flowed but constituted a much smaller proportion of the total immigration. The cities of the northeast were the leading region in number of ethnic migrants.

In 1920 a new phase began which would continue until 1960, the phase of the Growth of the Number of Large Cities. In these forty years the number of cities of more than 250,000 in population size increased from 25 to 50. The phase initiated the urban domination of the United States social structure, since in 1920 the number of persons living in urban places became for the first time greater than the rural population and greater than the number living in places under 2500 persons in size. Thus it is obvious that the United States has been urban-based for less than two generations. Major changes in urbanization and the forces of ethnicity took place during this phase. First, the flow of foreign-born immigration was sharply reduced by the immigration quotas established by Congressional legislation during this period. This reduction of European immigration flow stimulated new sources of immigration -- Canada, Puerto Rico, Mexico and the Philippines. It also encouraged internal migration

especially by rural Southern Blacks to northern cities. Second, the great economic depression of the 1930's dealt a severe blow to urban growth and to the economic and social advancement of ethnic groups during the 1930's. Ethnics which had concentrated in industrial cities were particularly hard hit by unemployment and limited employment during these years. The 1940's by contrast, as a decade of high employment tied to WW II, restored ethnic economic prosperity and encouraged further internal migration to war production centers especially in the south, southwest and west. Postwar economic prosperity set the stage for the great internal migrations to the suburbs of the large cities which had emerged during the phase.

The urban phase, Emergence of the Spread Metropolis, began about 1960. It is characterized by, among other things, the suburbanization of the population of large cities. By 1965, for the nation as a whole, about fifty per cent of the population in the fifty-five largest metropolitan areas (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas defined by the U. S. Census) lived in the suburban ring of these areas. The suburban migration was made possible in part by the availability of private transportation in the form of the automobile, the support by the Federal government through the FHA of the purchase of middle-class housing in the suburban areas, and general economic affluence which permitted a high rate of purchasing of automobiles and housing. Ethnic groups participated in this movement to the extent to which they had achieved economic affluence mainly through advancement in the occupational structure. The early 1960's were a time of rapid increase of the number of Blacks in the central cities of metropolises in both south and north. By the end of the decade several cities such as Washington, D. C. and Newark, New Jersey, had Black residents as the majority of the population. In a number of cases Blacks moved into neighborhoods

from which ethnics were migrating to the suburbs.

If the trends set into motion in the 1960's continue to the end of the century and there is now no apparent national urban policy which would discourage the present line of urban development, the result will be that approximately three-quarters of the national population will be concentrated in about fifty super-metropolises. Already by 1970 almost 45% of the nation are living in thirty metropolitan areas of 1,000,000 or more in number of residents. In those metropolises of this size which are located in the midwest and northeast, ethnic groups and Blacks constitute almost two-thirds of the population although this proportion varies by metropolis. New York probably has the highest ratio of Blacks and ethnics.

Major ethnic groupings which have been involved in the Urbanization of the United States.

The basic pattern of ethnicity in the U.S. was well established by 1910. As of that date about 15% of the national population was foreign-born and examination of the place of origin and characteristics of these immigrants shows that eight national jurisdictions accounted for almost 90% of these persons. These eight major sources included Great Britain, Ireland, Scandinavia, Austro-Hungary, Russia, Italy and Canada. In 1960 the pattern of major sources of all migration to the United States between 1820 and 1960 was still the same with only Mexico added to the list of places of origin which have contributed more than a million migrants. The overview of ethnicity in the United States can probably be stated in terms of those ethnic groups who have come from these major sources although it means ignoring many distinctive and viable ethnic traditions such as the Greeks, Chinese, Armenians, Lithuanian, Jamaicans, etc. Insofar, however, as there is a

basic pattern to the adaptation of migrants who arrived in the 19th and 20th centuries to American society, the immigrant streams from these nine sources should indicate this pattern.

Understanding or explaining such a pattern calls for a concept which touches on the variation in the social experience of immigrant groups. Such a concept is that of the "viable ethnic grouping". This term refers to an immigrant population that has maintained social cohesion and promoted identification with its cultural and historical tradition. Some distinction can be made between ethnic groups which are more viable and those which are less viable. The more viable would include the following, Irish, Czech, Hungarian, Slovakian, Croatian, Jewish, Italian, Polish and Mexican. Less viable would be represented by German, English, Swedish and Canadian. Several points are revealed by comparing these two listings. First, the less viable are more like the original W.A.S.P. majority. As individuals they could be more easily identified with the majority. Second, the settlement of the less viable groups was more often in the rural, small-town and non-urban places than the other group. In short, social distance from the original W.A.S.P. majority plus successful adaptation to the city encourages a viable ethnic group. Until the present time the most simple test of ethnic viability is the maintenance of well-defined ethnic neighborhoods either in Central City or suburbs.

What are the characteristic traits of the more viable ethnic groupings? I would distinguish four such criteria:

(a) Social and economic homogeneity which often reflected immigration to the United States during a relatively short period as for ex-

ample the Italians and Czechs. By contrast, the German and Canadian immigration extended over almost a century.

(b) Organizations developed to promote accommodation of immigrants especially to the urban activity, as for example the Polish Alliance, American Jewish Congress and Order of Sons of Italy.

(c) Shared concern with the political fortunes of the motherland, especially as they emerge as independent states as in the cases of Ireland, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Israel.

(d) Continuing religious participation in a single religious tradition, normally either Roman Catholic or Jewish.

These four characteristics provided shared symbols and a sense of meaningful group membership under conditions where the new migrants were confronted by other sharply different cultural groups living in the same cities. The more viable groups are predominantly urban and viable ethnicity is functional for adaptation to conditions of urban life in the United States as they have existed for the past century.

The Challenge of the Expanding Metropolis to Ethnicity

The American urban community is entering the metropolitan phase which I noted earlier, and this development raises the question in which way does this latest urbanizing phase threaten viable ethnicity? To answer this question calls for definition and delineation of the major processes which are restructuring our urban communities.

There appear to be at least four such influences operating which impinge upon the total ethnic community. They are:

(a) Invasion by new land-uses and by new populations of ethnic neighborhoods in central cities as the central city deteriorates both physically and in respect to supplying local services.

(b) Changes in the occupational careers of ethnics as the economic base of cities shifts from industry and blue-collar jobs to services which are occupationally associated with professions and white collar jobs.

(c) The increase in demand for higher education which is both necessary for and also supported by white-collar occupations and rising levels of personal income.

(d) Changing patterns of ethnic political activity in the metropolis -- a new involvement in politics in response to challenges to the ethnic tradition. These challenges include issues such as public support for parochial schools, the services for urban neighborhoods such as police protection and the related issue of "law and order," urban renewal which destroys ethnic neighborhoods, etc. Ethnic political response is creating new political leadership in the cities and playing an increased role in local elections. The result is an intensification of "coalition" politics in which ethnic voting blocs are crucial.

How will these four conditions operate on ethnicity within the massive metropolises now emerging? Is the tradition of "viable ethnicity" itself entering a new phase? In answer to these questions I will hazard the following observations concerning three crucial areas of ethnic life.

First a key influence is the changing position of the ethnic groups in the occupational structure of our metropolises. As economic opportunity improves for a group it moves up the occupational ladder -- away

from blue collar jobs to white collar jobs. This movement is partly influenced by the extent to which members of the group had previously gone into business for themselves -- since private enterprise more than another device gives economic opportunity and provides for occupational advancement of a group. Some ethnic groups such as the Irish showed little propensity to set up their own business. Others like the Jews entered into all kinds of economic enterprises founded by families or parternerships.

If a group does not have such a tradition of self-employment -- as do the Greeks and Chinese -- some other avenue of occupational effort must be pursued to take advantage of economic opportunity. In a growing city these avenues are found in expanding careers of personal services, sales, white-collar skills involved in office work, semi-professions such as teaching, nursing, social work, and technical skills going with the new technology such as the electronics field. These occupations service the needs of the local population and the demand for them is proportional to the size of the local community. There is a strong demand for them in the developing metropolises. Formerly-blue-collar-groups move into these service occupations as the educational level of the group increases. Higher education is crucial for the semi-professional occupations and more technical skills. Even protective occupations such as police work, are beginning to emphasize college training. Obviously college or university experience is becoming a prerequisite of general occupational achievement. For example, the Jewish community has achieved much of its amazing occupational mobility through this route of higher education. There is evidence that for the first time the educational aspirations of Catholic ethnics are increasing to the national level and it is estimated that almost a majority of

male Catholic adolescents expect to go to college. Some recent studies have shown that the educational aspirations of Catholic youth exceed those of Protestants in the more fundamentalist denominations. Also, students in some Catholic High Schools show aspirations for college well above the national average.

These trends suggest that ethnic groups will be able to take occupational advantage of the economic opportunity offered by metropolitan growth in the communities in which they live. This development will move many ethnic groupings into middle-class occupational status. The issue raised here, but not yet resolved, is can this development in occupational careers be consistent with and not disruptive of the ethnic tradition as an adaptation to urban life?

A second trend to be considered concerns the effect of this predicted occupational advancement of ethnics upon the future of the ethnic neighborhood. The residential concentration of members of ethnic groups in either central city or suburb has seemed to many to be the cornerstone of ethnicity and the foundation of group interaction and identified action. Most of the ethnic neighborhoods are still in the central city, and it has been feared that movement to the suburbs would break down the intensity of group interaction.

It appears that progressive obsolescence of housing and the physical facilities of the central city during the next generation will encourage a search for improved residential locations by most ethnic groups --especially if their economic situation improves. Evidence on suburban migration to date, however, suggests that if ethnic families move at roughly the same time that concentration of members of the group is maintained in the new location. In fact, there are some suggestions from

studies in New York that migration to the suburbs, associated with middle-class affluence, may intensify identification with and participation within the ethnic group.

Predictions about Ethnicity and the Pluralistic Metropolitan Community

What conclusions, if any, can we come to then by way of predicting the future of viable ethnicity within the framework of the expanding metropolitan community. The following generalizations appear to be consistent with the data presently available, although developments during the 1970's will certainly involve factors whose influence cannot now be estimated.

1. Ethnic groupings will persist as major social traditions in the urban community -- not as a consequence of continued immigration, but as a result of their present cultural characteristics of "viable ethnicity."
2. This vitality of ethnic tradition raises a real doubt about the validity of the 19th century rationale of the W.A.S.P. majority that Americanization would assimilate ethnics into a homogenized middle-class, dominated by Protestant and individualistic values such as achievement, effort, striving and the American brand of liberalism.

(Parenthetically it might be suggested the Immigration Act of 1924 seems to be an effort to cut off ethnic immigration because the old W.A.S.P. majority with its agrarian, small town Protestant ideology felt threatened by the growth, through foreign immigration, of the cities and their heavily ethnic population. The melting pot ideology may actually have been a rationale for deculturizing immigrant peoples under the guise of making them Americans and thus reducing their political and economic power.)

3. The vitality of the ethnic groups in the year 1970 suggests that a new rationale for inter-group relations in the United States is now emerging. The viewpoint is pluralistic in contrast to the assimilationist ethnic of the old W.A.S.P. majority. This pluralism could work out in the context of the developing metropolis where the great mass of the American people will be living within two or three decades. The pluralist interaction of culture groups will to a large extent take place within the framework of the political institutions. It will express itself through the public opinion process, elections, political campaigns, community action programs, and local policies dealing with metropolitan problems. It will be reflected in shifting political coalitions of local culture groups especially in connection with elections.

4. The scenario for this drama of political behavior has been anticipated in New York City, the great American laboratory of experiment in ethnic relations. The cast of actors in the old industrial centers of the northeast and midwest metropolises such as Pittsburgh, Chicago, Cleveland, Baltimore, are developing into metropolitan electorates whose make-up is roughly as follows:

1/3 white Protestant

1/3 white Catholic ethnic

1/6 black Protestant

1/6 Jewish and independent

Each of these four groupings seems to have a major and minor

faction -- as in New York, the Catholics split between Irish and Italians, or in many cities such as Washington, the Blacks splitting between militants and conservatives. It will be in the political coalitions of these factions that the interaction of the basic segments of the population will operate at the metropolitan level. One important consequence of this process might be that the White Protestant will come to see himself not as the symbol of the majority but rather as another culture group which achieves its goals through interaction and transactions with other local culture groups and traditions.

5. The reason for this coalition process of local government will be the immensity in size of the metropolises which are now emerging. The largest twenty of these monster cities will be larger than the smallest twenty separate states of the Nation.

6. One final observation is that the pluralist trend in culture group relations does not mean that there will be no central values of the total society. The emerging mass culture transmitted through the media of televions, radio, newspaper and magazine will give a content shared by almost all the members of the society. At the same time, however, it will be in the great metropolises, that the major ethnic traditions which have resulted from the experience of immigrants with the urban community in the United States will be maintained.

Bibliography of Works Consulted

U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1961, Washington, D. C., 1961

The U. S. Book of Facts, Statistics & Information for 1967 (based on Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1967), Washington Square Press, Inc., New York, 1967

U. S. Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States, 1789-1945, Washington, D. C. 1949

Recent Social Trends in the United States, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1933

Herbert J. Gans, The Urban Villagers, New York: Free Press, 1962

Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot, Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press 1963

Oscar Handlin, The Uprooted, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1952

A. Lewis Rhodes and Charles B. Nam, "The Religious Context of Educational Expectations," in American Sociological Review, Vol. 35, April 1970, pp. 253-266

R. A. Schermerhorn, These Our People, Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1949

Roger Starr, Urban Choices: the City and Its Critics, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967

Conrad and Irene B. Taeuber, The Changing Population of the United States, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1958

W. Lloyd Warner, American Life: Dream and Reality, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953

ETHNIC CIRCUMSTANCE: AMERICAN AT THE POLLS

Richard M. Scammon*

* Director, Elections Research Center, Governmental Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.
Editor, AMERICA VOTES
Co-author, THE REAL MAJORITY
Sometime Director of the Census

In summarizing the character of the American electorate in the 1970's - the picture of "America at the Polls" - the role of ethnicity is a difficult one to evaluate. We know who the voters of the 1970's are going to be, since almost all of them are here right now; less those who may become citizens in the next decade (and that number won't be large in a Presidential voting public of 80 or 90 million), they've all been born and they are here in America today.

We know these voters are <u>increasingly</u> <u>metropolitan</u> in character, for two of the greatest postwar phenomena in this country have been the flight from the land and the flight from the core city. You have all seen the first if you've driven out to rural America - the abandoned homes, the boarded-up small town stores, the missing doctor, the barber who opens his shop only on Friday night and Saturdays. And you've seen the decline of the core city, too, many times with the same deserted look of the small town. The statistics are clear, and this year's Census will simply spell out and firm up what we know now - that more and more of our people are suburbanizing, or exurbanizing, or metropolitanizing, or whatever you want to call it. This trend will be marked by this Census of 1970, but there is no reason to believe it will stop there. The trend is likely to continue, right into the 1970's and beyond.

But we know more of our electorate than just that they are becoming less rural, less core city, and more metropolitan. <u>Women are becoming the larger group amongst our voters</u>. For some years, the excess of women over men in the adult age group in this country has run into the millions. But American women, like their sisters in other countries, tend to vote less percentage-wise than do men. So it is that this overage in the total adult population has become an overage in the <u>voting</u> population only in the last six or eight years.

But it is there now, and will remain there unless women suddenly stop voting in percentages close to the male total (which seems unlikely as we celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of national suffrage for women), or until the male adult population comes close to the female in total numbers, which seems unlikely unless we can slow down the male death rate - a project any 55-year old male (namely, me) would certainly welcome.

Now besides metropolitanization and feminization, the electorate remains middle-aged. The average voter in 1968 was 47, and this year it might be a bit higher, for the younger voter tends to "fall out" more in off-year elections than do the middle-aged and older. Sometimes we hear that the median age of our population is in the late twenties and that therefore this is the era of "kid" politics. This is nonsense. When the voting age is 21, the median age of those 21 and over is in the middle forties. Given the tendency of young people to vote less than the middle-aged, this in turn gives us a higher (i.e., 47) age for the median voter. One might add that this is universal in the democracies and for good reasons. The youngest potential voters haven't yet set down roots, many aren't yet away from their schooling, some will be in military service, and all these reasons tend to give us a measurably lower percentage voter turnout in the "under 30's" than on, say, the 35 to 65 group.

Even should present proposals to lower the voting age to eighteen be successful, the median age of all voters in 1972 probably wouldn't fall below 45, given the known voter participation ratios for the various age groupings.

Fourthly, the great mass of American voters are White - a good 90%; nine percent are Black, one percent Filipino, Chinese- and Japanese-American, Indian, and so on. These figures don't hold everywhere of course. There

are wards, and counties, and Congressional Districts which are heavily Black. The District of Columbia has a Black majority and Hawaii has what the Census Bureau calls an "other races" majority, reflecting the large Asiatic ethnic population of the islands. But overall, in the whole nation, the white voter is in the overwhelming preponderance.

Finally, the electorate of the seventies is in largest part what we might call "middle class" - not all middle, and much of the middle perhaps could be better identified as "lower middle" reflecting the explosion in the past generation of much of at least the white working class into the lower middle economic grouping. But it would be wrong to call great sections of the American electorate of the 1970's "poor," in the sense of, say, the Social Security definition of poverty. A lot of this lower middle class is a long way from affluence, and if the electorate can be called "unpoor" it can also be called "unrich," but the poverty-ridden would not be a large segment of America at the polls in 1970 . . . not, at least, so far as we can see. If they do become a large part, if the middle class becomes poor as it did in 1931 and 1932, then we may well see our politics change in the 1970's as much as they did in the 1930's.

Now, you'll note I've not listed the ethnic character of the voter in these five groupings - metropolitan, middle-aged, white, middle-class, and with a majority of women - of our voters in this coming decade. The reason is a simple one - the ethnic population is just awfully hard to classify for future politics. Some, to be sure, remain easy to identify, for example, the Jews. Jewish voters have been liberally-oriented for many years, and vote today in very large numbers for liberal and for Democratic candidates, but this was not always so. Years ago many Jews were Republicans, and even today it is not certain

how Jewish electors will vote. For example, Jewish precincts in Los Angeles, which voted 85% or 90% for Hubert Humphrey in 1968 for President, turned right around the following year and split their ballots about evenly between Mayor Sam Yorty and Black challenger Tom Bradley. The same was true that year in New York city; Mayor John Lindsay, the liberal (and Liberal) nominee, got only about half the vote in Jewish precincts. In both cases there was a class differentiation, with wealthier Jews evidently being more inclined to vote "liberal" than their not-so-wealthy co-religionists.

Among Black citizens, too, there can be substantial change to meet new political circumstances, and political division, too. Baltimore Black precincts which had voted overwhelmingly for Democrat Lyndon Johnson for President in 1964 turned around in 1966 to vote Republican (for Spiro Agnew) for Governor against a Democrat perceived by Blacks to be anti-open housing. But these same precincts turned around still again and voted heavily for Humphrey in 1968. Within the black community there can be differing political views as well, as indicated in Atlanta's contest for Mayor in 1969, when some Blacks voted in the city primary for a Black man, others for a liberal White.

What can be said for the Jew and the Black citizen can be said for almost every ethnic minority in America today: Irish, Italian, Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, Polish, whatever it may be. There is no absolute political party identification and no absolute issue identification, either. Indeed, for some ethnic groups it would be hard to even identify the range and character of identification of any kind. As an example from contemporary life, consider the different identification found among British American Protestants (say a Canadian Presbyterian from Ontario) as opposed to a French Canadian Catholic living in northern New England. The first is scarcely identifiable as an ethnic group, the other is very much so.

The same is true of many ethnic groupings in America. I remember as a young student in Minneapolis that our college newspaper was published on the press of a local Swedish-language daily called the TIDENDE. While I was a student that paper went from a daily to two-or-three times a week, then to weekly, then monthly, and I believe it finally died a few years ago. What happened there in Minneapolis happened to so much of the foreign language pres and it represents the amalgamation of a large "ethnic" segment into a merged population. For example, even though Minneapolis is regarded as perhaps the biggest "Swede City" in America, it has had only a few Swedish-origin mayors, though its twin city, Saint Paul, with a large Catholic population, has had a number of Irish Catholics as the city's chief executive. Of course, this may not be ethnic politics at all; maybe it just shows the Irish are better politi cians than the Swedes.

A final example from the 1930's. I recall watching an election just before the World War, a city council election in Toledo, Ohio, held under the proportional representation plan in which the voter marked his ballot with numbers - 1,2,3, and the like - instead of crosses. Toledo had a large Polish population, and one of the candidates that year was a Polish-American, Ollie Czelusta. Sure enough, one could tell the turn-out for Czelusta because so many of the ballots marked with a "1" for Czelusta had their choice number "7" with a line through the seven in the European manner. My guess is that you wouldn't find so many today, even if Toledo still maintained the proportion-al system of voting, just as you wouldn't find so many of the Swedish newspapers. The reason is simple enough - the old folks have died off. So often the original immigrant has gone and his sons and daughters, and their children, and their children's children, are the major carriers of ethnic strains in America today.

But we all recognize a new kind of ethnicity in America today, and we recognize it in politics as we do in so many other streams of American life. It is not only a pride in heritage and past achievement, it is a concern over present situations and values. That is why we can speak of a "Cosmo" vote in Cleveland, or of an "ethnic" vote in Chicago, because much of the voting of so-called White ethnic Americans concerns itself now not with voting <u>for</u> the ". . ski," or the Irisher, or the Italian, but for something else, for a value system which the ethnic may feel to be under attack as strongly, maybe even more strongly, than the N-N WASP (native-born of native-born parents, White Anglo-Saxon Protestant).

It is often in the defense of these values, in the defense of what some would call the White ethnic view of social order, that a good deal of this new ethnic political vitality may be sensed. We don't know how far this new vitality will go, and indeed it is a vitality (and a concern) shared by many voters without a specific ethnic interest, by Blacks and Whites, by Jews and Gentiles, by Catholic and Protestant. In this "joined" sense this new vitality is non-ethnic and perhaps this, more than any other evidence, represents the paradox of the new importance of ethnic politics in a non-ethnic set of political and social values.

RETHINKING ETHNIC IDENTITY:

THE GROUP AND THE PERSON

Otto von Mering*

* Visiting Professor of Anthropology, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H. 1970-1971
Professor of Anthropology, University of Pittsburgh, School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, Pa.

THE POINT OF DEPARTURE

During the past decade a surfeit of compelling historical and economic reasons has prompted educators, policy makers, social scientists and the press to re-examine the phenomenon of ethnic difference and conflict in American life. It is not my intention to review the fact and opinion about this complex phenomenon; nor do I propose to comment on the many remedies proposed and already tried for the resolution of its problems. This has been done with varying degrees of completeness and expertise,[1] and I have concluded that we already know enough fact to initiate all the changes necessary for the betterment of the quality of everyday life.

On the other hand, there still exists an over-riding need to rethink our cognitive and perceptual approaches to the problem of inter-group living and the development of an ethnic person identity. The need is apparent when we consider the fact that all major human experiments in living and social change are predicated on the existence of a shared or "public motivation" for a deeper understanding of the sources of individual and social being. It matters little whether the context of this motivation is a pre-industrial society or a poly-ethnic and highly diversified industrial nation.

Hence, if we do speak in terms of this country's present ethnic and racial predicaments, we must proceed by dedicating ourselves to rethink their root and expression in daily life. If we can do so - and I believe we can - then it is also possible to make our renewed understanding not only a matter of personal growth and conviction, but also a primary national goal. If we do this well, hopefully we can acquire the special sense of commitment which enables us to bring about the changes we want and need the most.

SOME BASIC ASSUMPTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

Since we are concerned with the rise of a new "public will" to work for informed change toward a better life of every citizen, it seems entirely fitting that I share with you first my reasons for gathering and ordering useful knowledge about America's social history and culture. I share with Kenneth Clark a number of fundamental convictions:

> Order is better than anarchy (and) creation better than destruction; I prefer gentleness to violence and forgiveness to vendetta. On the whole I think that learning is preferable to ignorance, and I am sure that human sympathy is better than ideology. (And), ... I believe in the ... genius of individuals and I value a society that makes them possible. [2]

Taking these convictions for granted as a person, I, as a citizen, believe that the poly-ethnic past <u>all</u> Americans share must be understood as a unique "Right to Be Different." First, I see it as a <u>social privilege</u> which is needed for all minorities to live equably and peaceably with one another. It is, moreover, a <u>personal right</u> of everyone who, from time to time, has to think, feel and act as "a minority of one," and who must be able to conduct himself, when the occasion demands, as an "intercultural broker" and mediator to his fellow man. Thus, the right to be different also is a <u>human obligation</u> for the citizen who, steeped in the concerns of different minorities, can point to and work for new roads to agreement and representative action.

Given these assumptions as a person and as a citizen, I also believe it to be <u>the</u> basic goal of a democratic form of government to provide sound means for creating and assuring an <u>enlightened electorate</u> from generation to generation. Indeed, this is its constant covenant and over-riding function quite apart from promoting and supporting mission-oriented programs in health, education, welfare and labor.

I conceive an enlightened electorate to be the embodiment of four sensibilities and capacities. First, an enlightened electorate understands its uniquely positive and plural ethnic heritage of self-help and group identity within a larger national political framework. Second, it comprehends its special history of diverse, yet cumulatively cohesive actions for improvement of individual lifeways and intergroup living. Third, it is an electorate which knows how to use the essential democratic tradition of creative compromise between seemingly irreconcilable opposites of race, creed, ethnicity, status, and color. Lastly, it does so through the continuous sharing and negotiated division of the abiding self-interests of social man.

It is, therefore, self-evident that we as citizens must earnestly consider and plan for new national educational means to build human knowledge resources which are needed today for tomorrow. Restated, we must seek to transform the home and the community, but especially the classroom from places of the one-way transmission of information, skill and value into a setting for humanistic inquiry into the sources of one's being and present social existence. As Charles Silberman says, "What tomorrow needs is not masses of intellectuals, but masses of educated men, men educated to feel and to act as well as to think."[3]

It is my contention that a national objective of guaranteeing an enlightened electorate can only be viable if it fulfills two criteria. It must be built upon this country's cultural history of life-giving beliefs, ideas and practices, and it must be a complete record of all its people, made audible and visible through the medium of art and humanistic science.

A NEW ROAD TO UNDERSTANDING INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP ETHNICITY

Beginnings:

There are two major approaches to an understanding and knowledge of the source and meaning of a personal sense of ethnic identity, and of its corollary, a group expression of ethnic identity. Even though each approach subsumes a different theoretical apparatus and requires its special methodologies, the informed mind must rely on both to arrive at a felicitous and incisive formulation of the nature and consequences of the phenomenon of ethnicity in individual and social action. Thus, we shall hereafter use this term to designate the individual experience and social reality of ethnic identity.

The two conceptual models needed for the reasoned elucidation of ethnicity can be briefly stated. Socialization is a matter of learning about man-made structure; individuation is a matter of understanding processes of human nature. What the individual must learn and will repress in order to live in his society is not identical with what he can learn or wishes to forget. What the group believes to be basic, it often practices as a convenience. When it speaks of loyalty it wishes perhaps subservience alone, and where it is weakest, it may well find its strength to endure.

Thus, we may speak of the "individual way" of perceiving and living with ethnicity. It is a way of behaving according to a special sense of "coming face-to-face and to terms with one's own." Then there is the "group way" within and for the sake of ethnicity. It is a pattern of living and working, of presenting oneself and of performing among fellow man with historical symbols, special legends and conventional "social pieties" or actualities.

For the individual, to have and to experience ethnicity involves one or all of the following processes:

(1) a searching introspection into one's past - one's name and lineage, one's ancestral village and general territory of origin;
(2) a critical appraisal of one's integrity as a person - personality;
(3) a comparative measuring of one's sense of worth and special quality as a social being;
(4) a cumulative judgement of one's sense of place and fellowship as a producer/consumer in a changing or unequal social order.

People vary in the intensity and breadth of coming face-to-face with their own. They also differ from one another in the manner in which they come to terms with it. For some, this is a highly condensed and simple understanding; for others, it is a protracted experience. From our point of view, however, it is sufficient to know that a person who has undergone this experience reflects in word and deed, the perennial categorical shadows of race, creed and national origin.

For the group - its leaders, spokesmen, followers and hangers-on - having and using ethnicity may be a matter of one or several ways of behaving:

(1) presenting and demonstrating to selectively targeted "other people," or to "outsiders" in general, the visible signs and symbols, both traditional and fictive, of "race," creed and national origin;

(2) calling, naming, and blaming another person or group; picking on and labeling a thing or event as one sees it, yet claiming to "tell it as it is;"

(3) claiming for one's group an indefinable, unique aura of "special sensitivity" in order to classify "other kinds of people" into immutably lesser social beings and forms of existence;

(4) elaborating one's "consciousness of kind" for the purpose of controlling, influencing or posturing with a like-minded following inside a circumscribed social area;

(5) practicing ritual acts of alienation on particular "out groups" by making them into "un-persons" and "non-people," by perpetrating "rhetorical harm" on them, and by predicting, if not actually committing, a "final solution" on designated "strangers," "aliens," or all "enemies of the people."

It is usually beyond the interest, internal discipline or capacity of a given human group to become totally identified with all these modes of self-presentation and action. We do not have to be an historian, however, to know that man has visited such a calamity upon himself with uncomfortable frequency. This knowledge makes it imperative for us to recognize these ways of man as an ever-present and all too open field of options in the development of lasting negative mirror-images of self and other.

A symbolic summation:

It is parsimonious to recast the details of individual and group "ethnicity ways." Further reflection tells us that they are, in fact, "personal styles" of growing-up, thinking, feeling, and acting according to "ethnic frames of mind, self and turf." This formulation reduces the basic variables and interrelations needed to explain the phenomenon of ethnicity. As such, it reflects also the essential scientific practice of fashioning special languages to state the conceptual basis of given interpretations of the nature of man or the nature of things.[4]

Restated, the structural aspects of ethnicity ways can be understood in terms of readily identifiable processes of becoming a person and learning a distinctive ethnic style of living. No one is, after all, granted or ascribed full membership in any human group by virtue of his birthright

alone. On the contrary, every one must acquire useful as well as burdensome knowledge of self and other in the course of his passage into a changing "company of equals and betters" throughout the life cycle.

Human development cannot take place independently of a continuous "figure-ground" relationship between individual and group ways of behaving. Hence, becoming a particular kind of person and growing into ethnicity are always experienced as a coterminous process. For analytical purposes, however, we can distinguish seven interconnected dimensions of becoming a person and social being:

I. A GROWING UP of discovery and struggle with the "familial inheritance" of worldly and characterological assets and liabilities, the "inscrutable" antecedents and influences affecting the course of life from the moment of birth.

II. GROWING INTO, and learning to accept or reject a special sense of personal origin, family history and locality.

III. A GROWING OLDER of searching and finding a "rightful" or "false" direction of self expression and life-work.

IV. LIVING INTO and with a personal conviction of having a "just" and "deserved" place or an "unequal" and "undeserved" status among peers and contemporaries.

V. WORKING TOWARD and with a lasting personal stake, or working to fit into a "power niche," or moving about "going no place" in the existing social order.

VI. PREPARING FOR individual and social CHANGE in the course of taking active leave from selected fulfilled obligations, loyalties and commitments for the benefit of peers and younger people; or RESISTING CHANGE by "holding in" whatever activities there are, grasping to the point of becoming alienated

from one's talents and making strangers of one's fellow men.

VII. BECOMING a respected elder in later life, and, perhaps a "laudable ancestor" thereafter by the timely turning over of secular reigns to the next generation for the future social order; or DECLINING into "has-been personhood" and ENDURING as a déclassé person of fixed motives, only to end up in memoriam as a forgettable and perhaps blameworthy forebear.

Having said all this, it is next to impossible to convey all the subtleties of what it is and means to grow into selfhood and adult ethnicity, while learning to live and work as an Americanized person. I shall attempt to convey at least some by sharing with you my view of the scene in this polyethnic society. It may well serve to deepen our understanding that selfhood and ethnicity represent a special symbolic "summation" of developmental processes and behavior patterns. Given this insight, we may then appreciate also their significance as an explicit and implicit yardstick and guide for ordinary conduct at home, work and play.[5]

A VIEW OF THE SCENE

I find man's passage in and through the many rooms and mansions of society cluttered with the other side of contemporary civility. I see man hold on to the social "sins" of disinterest and neglect, of naming and blaming, of doing before choosing, of motion without movement, and of leaving before the count! Some people call such acts the sins of mortal flesh, but we all come to know them as the forked ways of man with one another. Their long and checkered record is a matter of individual chronology, custom and climate, season and geography.

I see a "scene" of rebels and rogues, activists and intruders, intermittently threatening social norms and magnifying moral trifles.

I see important people using the power of reason to dissemble truth, and "other people" responding with rage or despair. And, I have learned to recognize bullies and deceivers, liberators and oppressors who, abusing status and power, assure their pleasure in well-preserved lily pads.

I see an army of people saying rather than doing good deals to others in places high, middling and low. And, I have met a host of verbal tricksters who learn without studying and are "turned on" without thought, who emote with four letters and confront with ritual dialogue.

I have been told to watch out for suspicious characters who double up the out-group, or do their thing with "who's in" and sneer at those who want to climb on. I have also been warned about secretive and furtive "cats," all "souped up" on pot, speed and other feel-expanding drugs.

I am invited to meet a person; but I am introduced to a committee. I need a friend, but am referred to someone with influence. I am told about a new leader, but cannot find his following. I have paid a visit to "the establishment," but am directed to find its agent.

I am called upon to like the "propaganda of the deed," but the idea makes me doubt the word. I must tell a "pinko" from a "pig" and not confuse an "afro" with an "oreo;" and, I am supposed to know a "crypto" can't be a hero with three lives.

I have watched banality and temper tantrums, the sport of self-expansion and deceit. Young man, middling man no longer wants to be himself but must respond <u>with</u> himself: To relate is to demonstrate, is to acquire moral fibre and distinction! To "drop out" of "rat-racing" -- to "freak out" is to "groove in" the generation gap. To "express" is "open-ended experience": "I am plastic," "I am large, I contain multitudes" of movements; I come on "real" through "group-grope" and "group-grasp" to the Big Feel.

I have been asked to prevent loafers and shirkers, "cool-out" activist students, or do a "retreat" on teachers, all falling short in loyalty and obligation "to keep their place." I am to "turn my stomach" over people staging a "burn-in" with flags, cards and other symbols of identity or authority. I have also been approached to trust "real patriots," with gun, "cocktail" or placard, in and out of hunting season. And yes, my arm has been twisted to tell on anyone at all before he can disturb the sandbox of society!

I am perplexed, no stunned, to find the vocabulary of social fictions, villainy, and trifles so much more extensive than the grammar of social values and valor!

Can it be true, I ask myself, that all the desired and praised things of life - friendship and love, manliness and honor, respect and position, security, safety and health, and influence and power - exist in such small amounts among human kind? Do these goods only seem in short supply to people at both ends of the cycle of life? Does the middle possess them all?

Do the young alone have the right to accuse the people of the middle years of the error of their ways? Is it solely the aged for whom living a short-changed existence is a fated reality?

Regrettably, there is never a shortage of those who believe they know, and wish to speak for all of us. The older they are, the more they feel that the young must only see and say what they ought to. The younger they are, the more they wish to escape their early history, and the more they fling warmed-over dogmas at the unfeeling world. Neither the young nor the old recognize their silent paternship with the middling years in creating the new fictions of today.

I have reflected upon this scene because somehow it seems expected of me. Because I am a former young man I must listen to my fellow adults. But, most of all, I wonder how little prepared we are for the uncertain duration of adulthood.

I see widespread adult illusion about the ignorance of the young. I hear much carping about their impetuousness but little recognition of our personal past in their deeds. And, I hear no one inveighing against the ever present danger of man's ancient custom of SOCIAL CLASSIFICATION in everyday life.

There is much fatuous talk about, but no real understanding of man's groping and grasping search for a sense of personal history: I have listened to long words about man's random motions for a sense of place and membership in society. I have noticed old and young fools insist on confusing woman with girl, a "hen" with a "chick." I have been talked at by boys who thought they were men; I have been harangued by some avant garde who confuse sex with gender. And, I have endured those who equate life with youth, or condemn age with sickness and death.

I have met all kinds of "foreigners" and "aliens," "under-dogs" and "underclasses," "natives" and "migrants." And, I have read about the "forgotten," "invisible," "troubled" or "silent majority." In one way or another, I sense that they remain strangers to those who reckon themselves alone as "natives" in good standing.

I have heard that the "old immigration" was better than the "new." I have discovered that "the Anglo Saxon" is "different," whereas "all immigrants are alike": the former is the "native," the latter are "foreigners." The one has "the backbone," the others have "the strong back." While one "occupied the space," the others "kept their place." One did what he thought

best, the others what they were told. I have resisted concluding that "he who came later was just naturally less American."

In my travels I have listened to stories of "we have no little Italy's," "there is no Servian Ellis Island here," and "we have no real ghettos;" "the Germans assimilated long ago!" "See for yourself," I was told, "we really are an integrated community, we have no problems." I learned that the short English word is most powerful. How incredibly powerful the word "real" must be that "ethnic" cannot be because it is not allowed to be!

I still feel all shades of power: ethnic, black, white, red, and "almost white," but most of all "green." I am surrounded by all age-grades of tyranny: infantile, youthful, middling and fossilized. And, I must find my way beneath all manner of importance and hypocrisy - co-existing and colliding in continuous contemptuous propinquity.

I continue to see people act as if character sprang from trial and error in one random group after another. I notice people moving about within their select colonies, busily sorting and making out on all the little inequalities among equals. I hear the sound but not the voice of people who exaggerate minute differences in physical strength, in size, in manner of speech and gesture, in age, in dress and, of course, in color.

Would that it were true that as the child in man grows older these small differences did not lose their innocence to become the exclusive motives of conduct! Instead, I see young and adult alike still looking for the promised land! Just like the child who left the family-fold for his school mates - for the promised land, he is so sure - where peers relate to peers in full equality!

It would seem that altogether too many former children - former young people - have not come of age. Indeed, they cannot because of their dismay and perplexity about how very unequal life is among so-called equals.

If to be "here," to be "now," to be "something" is the thing, then man must cling to what he can readily see is different in stature and tint. Before long he is too busy getting - and yielding nothing of what he has not yet - to notice his own entrapment. No matter the time, place or occasion, he relies on externals alone to separate friend from foe. Philosophers recognize man's inhumanity to man in all of this. Let us, however, know it in more simple terms as CIVILIZED COWARDICE AND SOCIAL BIGOTRY!

It should not surprise us to see a surfeit of contemptuous "talk-doers" mount the platform of the day. They cannot keep apart a wild hope or wet dream from a worthy vision; and, to see them mingle with people who are "all feel" and "no do" is not strange. Each believes "things that are" have less worth than "things that are not." They also know how to blame the present for their own ineptitude. They only "tell it as it is," not as they see it!

It is not hard either to find that splendid mid-century dullard who bloweth neither hot nor cold. He acts himself into success, except when he lapses into "one of his black moods." He may speak the truth about himself then, and then alone. More often, he sees the "naked truth" in bared skin, only to kill the moment in eager drink, or in a bag with needle and spoon.

Too many of us in the middling years ignore our capacity for growth throughout life. We crave for the answer without the question. Truly, we have more energy than to marinate at home, at work and at play! "Being sound" or "being good to oneself" or good in the eyes of others has never been a by-product of "just clean living," "group living," "right living,"

"getting along" or "minding your own business!"

Life means understanding that love cannot maintain, but only contribute to order. It means discovering that self-love is idolatry, and self-hate unncessary torture, and that "absolute love" is like "absolute hate." All corrode the guts and make men of peace wage war.

Life means learning, knowing and feeling pain. It means learning that mere contact between unequals may be "playing-it-safe" but that co-mingling among equals, while often difficult, is more rewarding. It means, that finding a selfish interest to share is easy, wanting to divide it takes time and wisdom. This is the only equal chance for every Life.

Making individual life valuable to oneself and others, despite man's social villainy and pettiness is <u>the</u> substance of growing up. So is standing up to be counted in as a peer among ageless peers. And, on occasion, amidst a storm of young and old, to move as a "minority of one" is the crown of social growth!

To survive is to become a social animal; to live is to become a person! Again and again, it is required of us to confront and deal with all manner of unmentionable social deviltry and named trivia. We must also learn to endure the probability that our dearest friends, neighbors and relatives will be as unreasonable, and perhaps as perfidious as our favorite enemies. "Goodness" or "worthiness" is indeed an infrequent state for any age of man.

Of course, children are "good" but not in the dead of night alone; grown-ups are "good" too, very much like children, but not only in the middle of the day! Let us remember, Dotty Dimple, the naughty infant of the 1870's who said, "I know I don't ought to. I'm a going to do wicked and get

punished. I've been goody 'til I'm all tired up." All too often we find ourselves just as tired to be reasonable for just one second more.

No amount of angry moralizing, studied ignorance, or public speaking, psychologizing and image anxiety will make social bigotry go away! No amount of denying the existence of civilized cowardice, of posturing over it, retreating from it, or pinning it on those we do not like will change our habits! Such public virtue will never change the necessity for each of us - when the occasion demands - to personally exorcise the public ghosts and private fictions of the human scene.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

Having reached this point in our discussion, little reflection is needed to recognize the futility of belaboring "ethnic is what ethnic does" with the legend of the "melting pot" and one-sided notions of assimilation, adjustment and integration into "the American way of life." It is most regrettable that such gross simplifications of the phenomenon of ethnicity and immigration still becloud the majority of public opinion. Perhaps, they have done so only because the answers provided neatly explain away how this Republic actually came to have its present unique character as a poly-ethnic society.

Far too many "people in the know" still prattle piously about how easy it is "made in this country" for everyone to shet his ethnicity "if they only try hard enough." The wish to equate one-way assimilation with some vague molting process - as if ethnicity were but a raiment of the last season - is but a transparent denial of America's special history of "ingathering" foreigners since its inception. This country's people - of Celtic, eastern and southern European origin, the immigrants and descendants from the

Mediterranean littoral and the circum-Caribbean area, from Asia and South America, and the offspring of erstwhile slaves from Africa - these "new immigrants," and the only native American, the Indian, bear witness to their "old immigrant" equals of Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian descent, that becoming a person and "American" has been too often a process of unequal difficulty for them.

Different metals melt no better than people, separated by race, creed and national origin. Why assimilate unless and until a unifying ingredient and a suitable environment exists for coming together in the first place? It is my hope that if growing into adult ethnicity and self-hood is conceived as a special symbolic summation of developmental processes and behavior patterns, a compelling reason exists to do away with the outworn myths and nostrums of Americanization. If we unlearn them well, we will also acquire the unifying knowledge and courage needed to renew our quest for a fuller understanding of our cultural, social, and familial sources of individual being and citizenship. Untried and creative solutions to this country's present domestic predicaments await all who are willing to rethink the American way of life!

Let us be perversely just by judging the quality of ourselves and of our progeny by its least worthy members! Let us grant all the right to transcend their personal biography, so that we may transcend ours! We cannot let the child in man to be the guardian angel of his forked ways! We must understand that to be separated, estranged, and alienated from one place, person or thing, means to be linked to one another in a different sense and in another place!

R. A. Schermerhorn, Comparative Ethnic Relations, (N. Y.: Random House, 1970); A. M. Greeley, Why Can't They Be Like Us?, Institute of Human Relations Press, Pamphlet Series #12, (N. Y.: The American Jewish Committee, 1969); M. Lerner, "Respectable Bigotry," American Scholar, (Autumn, 1969), 606-617; P. Schrag, "The Forgotten American," Harpers, (August, 1969), 27 ff; A. Béteille, ed. Social Inequality, (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1969); Ethnic Heritage Study Centers, Hearings, General Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, 91st Congress, Second Session, 1970, (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.); P. I. Rose, The Subject Is Race, (N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 1968); O. Handlin, Race and Nationality in American Life, (N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957); This Was America, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949); A. B. Callow, Jr., ed. American Urban History: An Interpretive Reader With Commentaries, (N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 1969).

2. K. Clark, Civilization, BBC Publication and John Murray (London, U. K., 1969).

3. C. E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, (N. Y.: Random House, 1970).

4. M. Polanyi, Personal Knowledge, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958); Science, Faith and Society, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

5. The intellectual antecedents of this discussion lie in the work of Erik H. Erikson. The reader is referred especially to E. H. Erikson, Childhood and Society (N. Y.: W. W. Norton, 1950); and Insight and Responsibility, (N. Y.: W. W. Norton, 1964).

ETHNICITY IN AMERICAN SOCIETY:

SOME PROBLEMS OF A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK+

Richard Kolm*

+ The propositions in this paper were developed informally during the June 1970 workshop, and subsequently summarized in their present form. They are exploratory in character, and are intended for discussion and testing.

* Assistant Professor, National Catholic School of Social Service

Recent well-known developments - the Black revolution, the danger of confrontation between Blacks and the White working class (mostly ethnic in composition), and the attempts of ethnic groups to organize themselves for political action have aroused a great deal of renewed interest in ethnicity and ethnic groups. Subsequently, there also was an increased output of publication on the subject of ethnic groups (usually called minorities) in American society, mostly descriptive and analytical in character.

This paper is an attempt at a recapitulation of existing formulations on the subject, at developing a consistent theoretical framework relevant to the present situation, and providing a basis for defining research problems, for stimulating further theoretical explorations and for formulating action policies.

1. Ethnicity and ethnic groups - meanings, definitions and related concepts

   a. Ethnicity - A relatively new term, still seldom met in publications, books or articles, derives its meaning from the Greek word, ethnos, meaning tribe, race or nation, though recently it has been more often associated with another Greek term, ethos, meaning customs or patterns, because of its emphasis on social characteristics of groups rather than on their biological origins implied by the first term.[1] The term ethos probably also is much more plausible historically as most, if not all, of the existing present social groups have, during the long period of their historical existence absorbed so many foreign biological elements that it is probably impossible

to speak of biological homogeneity in any of the present social groups. Any distinctness these groups may have is due rather to the complex processes of change and modification of their life patterns in the constant social and cultural blending and fusion of various patterns through conquest and subjugation, through culture contact and diffusion, etc. Among others, Sumner used the term ethos for group characteristics.[2]

From the point of view of the general usages of the concept of ethnicity in the social sciences, the most common approach is probably the descriptive-comparative discussion of the material culture and customs, and mainly of folk cultural content (folklore, folkways, mores, customs, traditions, etc.) of concrete ethnic groups. Other approaches stress the relationship of ethnicity to social and cultural change and to problems of prejudice and discrimination.

The problem of essential meanings of ethnicity in modern society has not been extensively discussed. Westie calls the area of race and ethnic relations one of the most developed in sociological research, but one of the least developed areas in terms of theoretical formulation.[3] Weber discusses ethnicity in terms of its political or cultural origins.[4] Wirth discusses ethnic groups as minority groups and classifies them into four types: the pluralistic, the assimilationist, the cessationist and the militant groups. Parsons, using the structural-functional approach to ethnicity, defines ethnic groups in terms of kinship relations and includes them together with the family, class and community, in the

four basic structural components which must characterize every individual and every society. He regards ethnicity rather as a dysfunctional factor in relation to the universalistic-achievement type of society, as represented by the United States. However, he adds that its value as a focus for security beyond the family may supersede its dysfunctional aspects. He further thinks that with the increase of rational organization in society, ethnicity will decrease both in scope and in significance.[6]

Proposition 1 - As used in this paper, the term "ethnicity" refers to basic cultural patterns developed in the formative stages of historical social groups and preserved as modified in their later experiences. Essentially, ethnicity is concerned with the relational aspects of group life or, in other words, with the "social bond" in human groups, as it developed through historical experiences along with patterns of communication and cooperation and, above all, as it expresses itself in the concern of the group for survival through successful socialization of the young.

The above proposition has been formulated within the framework of the interrelationship of personality, society and culture systems, as based on the broader framework of symbolic interactionism, developed by George Herbert Mead, Ernst Cassirer, Susan K. Langer, Florian Znaniecki, Talcott Parsons and others.[7]

The emphasis on the "social bond" in ethnicity derives from the premise that it is a prerequisite to the development of culture and personality systems, as well as to the development of higher levels of social systems.

In the above sense, ethnicity relates to a variety of concepts such as Durkheim's "collective consciousness" and "mechanical and organic solidarity," Becker's "sacred and secular societies" and his four societal types, Parsons' "pattern variables" and his four societal types, Florence Kluckhohn's "five dominant and variant value orientations," Tönnies' "Gemeinschaft," Weber's "process of rationalization," Znaniecki's "definition of the situation" and many others.[8]

b. Ethnic groups - The term "ethnic groups" is often used interchangeably with the concept of "ethnicity" and will also be so used here. In general, the term "ethnic groups" refers to cultural subsystems of larger societies. It is being used increasingly as an overall term for cultural, racial, religious, national, linguistic or even purely social groups. The older classification into racial and ethnic groups is recently being abandoned in favor of "minority groups" which refers not so much to numerical dimensions but mainly to the status positions of groups in society with regard to equality in access to social economic opportunities of the society and to equal treatment in mutual relationship with the dominant groups.

As mentioned above, the relationship of ethnic groups to social class in American society has been brought into focus by the problem of the White working class and the danger of its confrontation with the Blacks. The theoretical aspect of this relationship has been discussed by Barber, Milton, Lewis, Cuber and Kenkel and others.[9]

Another recent trend seems to appear with the use of the concept of "subcultural groups" where ethnic groups are being considered to be a category of deviant groups in this society.[10]

One of the interesting results of the rediscovery of ethnicity in the United States was the surprise shown by the general society as well as by many social scientists about the persistence of ethnicity and especially of the White ethnic groups which were thought by many to have been absorbed completely. Some recent studies have shown, however, that the ethnic patterns continue to exist, despite even the increasing process of suburbanization and the dispersal of segregated ethnic communities in central cities.[11] Similarly, it was found that economic affluence and increased education do not directly affect the existing patterns of social interaction of attitudes and values in ethnic groups.[12] However, too little is known about these processes and further research is needed on the life of ethnic groups, the on-going changes in them, and on the relationship of ethnicity to society.

Following are four propositions on ethnic groups derived from the first proposition on ethnicity:

Proposition 2 - Ethnic groups are any groups which in their historical development have maintained a cultural distinctness from the wider social environment or from other groups (due either to cultural origins or to situational factors, physical, geographical or social) and which have been able to develop stable social structures and cultural patterns and a successful process of socialization for continuation of this distinctness.

Proposition 3 - The persistence of ethnic cultures is due mainly to the intrinsic nature of the socialization process and its role in the transmission of the complex symbolic systems of meanings and values essential in the integration of personality and of social systems.

Proposition 4 - The process of enculturation or of socialization in a given culture is not simply learning of specific habits and skills or of specific behavioral patterns. It involves a higher level of integration of motivational, attitudional and behavioral elements in the individual, and their integration with the social and cultural patterns, and includes both conscious-rational and unconscious-irrational mechanisms (identifications, repressions, defense, etc.). As a prerequisite of the continued existence of human groups, these problems of integration are an integral part of all human life as well as of social adjustment and of functioning of human societies and of cultural systems. By the reliance of these processes to a large extent on unconscious mechanisms, they are not subject to rational control and depend largely on traditional methods of transmission and on support of integrated social cultural systems in communities and societies.

Proposition 5 - Ethnic cultures as derived from historic roots are the result of the accumulated experiences of social groups and constitute their basic "web of life" in which personality, society and culture systems have achieved a degree of integration which assured the survival and development of these groups. The weakening of this ethnic content through increased emphasis on rationalization and individualization, on social mobility and secondary relations may be the cause of increas-

ing disorganization and disintegration of personality and social systems and of alienation of individuals from their societies. These negative effects may occur simultaneously with the growth and progress in other areas of societal life such as science, technology, education, etc.

On the other hand, emphasis on dysfunctional aspects of ethnicity such as on meaningless forms and contents and the neglect of its essential meanings may lead to rigidity, to exclusiveness and isolation, to lack of growth and development, to unrealistic self-images (ethnocentrism) and, finally, to conflicts.

2. Ethnic groups in society - the problem of cultural diversity (pluralism)

The above propositions leave still open the essential question of the plausibility of cultural diversity in society and of the relationship of cultural diversity to societal growth and development.

The problem of cultural pluralism versus homogeneity and its consequent ideologies of assimilation and absorption is, of course, not a new problem, especially in American society. While the absorption or assimilation theories were the most widely acclaimed since the beginning of American history, there simultaneously existed also the theories of cultural pluralism supported mainly by intellectuals and liberals.

Among the absorption theories the best known was probably the melting pot idea developed by Israel Zangwill in 1909 which postulated the ongoing process of blending of the best traditions and traits of all the ethnic groups into a new, dynamic American unity.[13] The attractiveness of this idea lies in the deceptive metaphor similar to the alchemists' dream of the philosophical stone. In practice the melting pot theory becomes only a semantic variant of the absorption theories.

The most outspoken philosopher of cultural pluralism in the United States is Horace Kallen who, together with his contemporaries, I. D. Berkson and Julius Drachsler, formulated the ideas of cultural pluralism and gave them wide publicity.[14] Using as a basis Dewey's ideas of the "democratic men" and democratic society, they asserted that immigrants coming from different cultures have not only the right to retain their cultural background but that society has an obligation to support and promote these various cultural affiliations for the sake of individual fulfillment and of democratic diversity.

Dewey's concepts mentioned above focused on the amelioration of conditions preventing the free expression of personality. Deploring the conditions created by massive industrialization, Dewey saw in a pluralistic society with its communities or "publics," as he called them (self-regulating, open to larger issues of the world, engaged in sharing of intelligence with other communities, and using scientific reasoning in solving their problems) the only guarantee for man to fulfill his potentialities.[15]

The contribution of the symbolic interactionist such as G. H. Mead, Ernst Cassirer and Susan Langer to the concept of cultural pluralism centers on their concept of culture itself.[16] Man, by organizing his sensory experiences in meaningful conceptual patterns through language and other symbolic forms, creates cultures which mediate the world to him, making it meaningful to him and subject to his mastery.

The development of culture necessitates a continuous process of communication and of consensual validation on motivational, attitudinal and behavioral levels. This is best achieved in cultural communities in which men live together, share their symbolic worlds as they developed in the

history of the groups and as they are continuously modified through contemporary experiences. These cultural communities are also a source of ethical and moral life fostering self-restraint and self-discipline, a source of strength resistant to alienation and personal or social disorganization, and a source of innovative change. Through participation in such communities, man finds a sense of identity and internalizes human values essential to the survival and development of society and, consequently, of himself.

Within this framework of symbolic interactionism, the following propositions regarding cultural pluralism can be formulated:

Proposition 6 - Cultural pluralism is directly a product of the symbolic nature of man and of the cultural processes in stable social groups. Given the framework of commonalities in larger societies as developed through historical experience and through intensive interaction based on the pervasive mass media, cultural pluralism can become the antidote to the deadening effects of mass culture and a source of creative social and cultural change.

Proposition 7 - The persistence of ethnicity as carried by ethnic groups in larger societies (e.g., American society) and the nature of the cultural processes, both in society and in the subgroups, suggest the feasibility and desirability of constructive interpretations and functions of ethnicity and of ethnic groups in society for the sake of society itself. Given the necessary acceptance and support by society, ethnic groups can assume the functions of Cassirer's cultural communities and of important socializing agents and thus make a significant contribution to society.

With specific application to American society, the above propositions pose a number of questions. They can be put in two larger groups. First, concerned with questions such as: what is the reality of ethnicity in the United States? What is the strength of ethnicity, the essential values preserved by the various groups, the relationship of these values to general American society norms and cultural values? What are the possibilities of acceptance of ethnic groups by society and of their creative, innovative functions in American society? What is the role of ethnic groups in achieving social peace and legitimacy, both from the point of view of the relationship of these groups to society and among themselves? What is the relationship of ethnicity to other structural elements in society, such as social class, community, region?

The second question is concerned with the feasibility and viability of cultural diversity (cultural pluralism) in American society. Taking into consideration the number of ethnic groups, their territorial distribution and concentration, is their enough of tangible, concrete substance to the ethnic groups if their role and function is to be used constructively? Is it not possible that rejection of ethnicity and of cultural pluralism in American society has been dysfunctional to the development of the social and cultural integration and a direct or indirect cause of the present social ills in society? And, obversely, is it possible that the acceptance of cultural pluralism would alleviate to some extent our problems of intergroup relations of alienation of youth and others?

The discussion of above questions should provide a sufficient basis for formulation of research ideas and for further theoretical analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Melvin M. Tumin, "Ethnic Groups," A Dictionary of the Social Sciences ed. by Julius Gould and William M. Kolb (New York: The Free Press, 1964), 244.

2. William Graham Sumner, Folkways (New York: Ginn & Co., 1906), 1-7.

3. Frank R. Westie, "Race and Ethnic Relations," Handbook of Modern Sociology ed. by Robert L. Faris (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1964), 576-618.

4. Max Weber, "Entstehung ethnishen Gemeinsamkeitsglaubens, Sprach and Kultgemeinschaft," in Wirtschaft and Gesellschaft (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr /Paul Siebeck7, 1947), I, 234-240.

5. Louis Wirth, "The Problem of Minority Groups," in Ralph Linton (ed.), The Science of Man in the World Crisis (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), 347-364.

6. Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951), 172-177, 188, 229.

7. George Herbert Mead, Mind, Self and Society, ed. Charles W. Morris (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934); Ernst Cassirer, The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953;- An Essay on Man (New York: Doubleday, 1953); - The Myth of the State (New York: Doubleday, 1955); Susan K. Langer, Philosophy in a New Key, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957); Florian Znaniecki, Social Actions (New York: Farrar & Rinehard, 1936); Talcott Parsons, Edward A. Shils, eds., Toward a General Theory of Action (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954).

8. Emile Durkheim, The Rules of the Sociological Method, translated by Sarah A. Solovay and John H. Mueller (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1938); Howard Becker, Through Values to Social Interpretation (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1950); Parsons, The Social System,op. cit.; Florence R. Kluckhohn, "Dominant and Variant Value Orientations," Personality in Nature, Society and Culture, ed. by Clyde Kluckhohn et al (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953); Ferdinant Tönnies, Fundamental Concepts of Sociology, translated and supplemented by C. P. Loomis (New York: American Book Co., 1940); Max Weber, Essays in Sociology, translated and edited by H. H. Girth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946); Florian Znaniecki, Cultural Sciences (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952).

9. Bernard Barber, Social Stratification (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1947); Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964); Blackways of Kent (University of North Caroline Press, 1955); John F. Cuber and William F. Kenkel, Social Stratification in the United States (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954).

10. David O. Arnold, The Sociology of Subcultures (Berkeley: The Glendessary Press, 1970).

11. Michael Parenti, "Ethnic Politics and the Persistence of Ethnic Identification," American Political Science Review (September, 1967), 721-722.

12. Raymond Wolfinger, "The Development and Persistence of Ethnic Voting," American Political Science Review (December, 1965), 904-906.

13. Israel Zangwill, The Melting Pot (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1920).

14. Horace Kallen, Culture and Democracy in the United States (New York: Boni & Liveright, 1924); - "Democracy Versus the Melting Pot," The Nation C (1915), 219; Isaac B. Berkson, Theories of Americanization, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College Columbia University, 1920); Julius Drachsler, Democracy and Assimilation (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1920).

15. John Dewey, Freedom and Culture (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939).

16. G. H. Mead, op. cit.; Ernst Cassirer, op. cit.; Susan Langer, op. cit.